

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9789

ments, have increased more than 400 percent. Obviously the size of the debt alone was not the major difficulty. The truth is that we have been growing up to a debt of this size, and the debt itself—in terms of its absolute magnitude—is actually much more manageable now than it was back in 1946.

The real difficulties in debt management were those of a structural nature. We came out of the war with the debt well under control and improved the situation even further during 1946 by paying off bank-held debt with surplus cash that was in the Treasury till. The average length of our marketable debt issues was close to 8 years and we had over \$43½ billion of the debt maturing out beyond 20 years. In a sense the Treasury lived off the fat of that good structure for a number of years. Attempts were made to maintain a balanced structure of the public debt but no consistent way was found to keep the structure from eroding and, although long-term issues were put out from time to time, the debt gradually shortened through the passage of time so that by the end of 1959 the average length of marketable debt was down to 4 years and 4 months and the amount of debt maturing out beyond 20 years had declined from \$43½ billion to only \$8 billion.

In the meantime market forces had brought interest rates up from the artificially depressed level of the war years to a level that was higher than those at the present time. The Treasury for a time found that it could not, because of the 4½ percent interest rate ceiling, sell any securities out beyond 5 years. Prior to this there had been a burst of speculation in Treasury bonds which had led to a massive oversubscription of the 2½'s of February 1965. This boom ended spectacularly in mid-1958 and in the face of the largest peacetime deficit of our history the Treasury had a series of financings that could be called successful only in a technical sense—the amounts needed were raised. In fact the market was not stabilized until late 1959 when the so-called magic 5's were issued.

In the interval the Treasury had been able to control the growth of the short-dated debt that matured in less than 1 year. This had risen from about \$55 billion to about \$80 billion—not an excessive increase in terms of the money market needs for a short-dated security. But this control over short-dated debt and the inability to issue long-dated debt created a buildup in the intermediate area so that the debt maturing in from 1 to 5 years increased from \$24 billion to \$61½ billion. All of this short intermediate debt could quickly spill into the shortest dated debt in just a few years. The need for debt lengthening was illustrated by a 1960 study of the potential increase in short-term coupon securities. These issues, excluding Treasury bills, totaled \$35½ billion in 1961 and could mount to \$93½ billion by 1964 if all the maturing debt had to be rolled over into short-term securities.

This steady attrition in structure was finally arrested in 1960 as the Treasury developed and tested new techniques in debt management that have proven to be quite successful. In the first place a larger part of the debt has been put on an automatic basis through the development of new Treasury bills, tapping the 6-months market and the 1-year market. Secondly, the long-term debt problem was met through the advance refunding technique. Under this technique securities are offered in exchange for longer-dated securities well in advance of their maturity. Since its first use in June 1960 there have been some 11 advance refunding operations and the turnaround in the structure of

the debt has been marked. Although marketable issues have increased by some \$25 billion since 1959 the under-1-year debt has grown by only \$8 billion, probably at a lesser rate than the liquidity needs of the economy. The over-20-year debt has more than doubled, growing from \$8 billion to very close to \$20 billion and over two-thirds of these long-term securities have come out of advance refundings. The average length of the debt has also improved and at the present time is up over a year in length, at 5 years and 3 months. The results are shown in the volume of financing the Treasury has to undertake. New cash borrowings in 1964 were \$11½ billion—down substantially from the \$25 billion of 1959. Maturities of coupon issues are also down to \$32½ billion from the \$42½ billion of 1959, and in terms of public holdings of the same down from \$23½ billion to \$14 billion. The better spacing of the debt has meant the Treasury can be in the market less frequently and for smaller amounts.

The second major current problem of the Treasury, the balance of payments, has compounded the problem of debt structure because we no longer can afford to be isolationists in our domestic monetary and debt management policies. In previous periods of business slack interest rates in our economy could go to any level without any serious consequences internationally. But since 1958 and 1959 when other major currencies of the world became fully convertible, as only the dollar had been since the early 1930's, our short-term interest rates can no longer fluctuate only in accordance with domestic needs. If Treasury bill rates had declined to as low as five-eighths of 1 percent per annum as they had during earlier business recessions we could have had a hemorrhage in our balance of payments as short-term funds sought higher rates abroad in equally liquid short-term instruments. As a result, we have consciously increased our short-term rates from the recent recession low of 2¼ percent to the current level of close to 4 percent. From a debt management standpoint this required a large increase in Treasury bills to put upward pressure on these rates. Since 1959 we have added \$20 billion to the amount of our regular Treasury bills. To keep the total of short-dated debt from growing by the same amounts, coupon issues have been reduced in size largely through the advance refunding techniques. As a result our short-dated debt total has only grown by \$8 billion.

At the same time as all of this was going on the Government and the Treasury had to be concerned with the financing of the deficits occasioned by failure of the domestic economy to perform at or near its potential. The direction of Treasury response has been to place as much of the debt increase as possible outside the commercial banks to avoid the possibility of any inflationary potential. This policy has also been highly successful. As a matter of fact, of the \$28 billion increase in the debt since January 1961, none of the increase has gone into the hands of commercial banks. Commercial bank holdings of Government securities are actually down by over \$2½ billion.

Banks have contributed to the record of sound debt management in other ways, by temporarily underwriting new issues thus facilitating their secondary distribution, by educating the public on the need for sound financial habits and practices, and by advising the Treasury on debt management through industry advisory committees. Another and vital service freely given by bankers has been your aid in the savings bond program without banker and other volunteer support we could not point with pride to the fact that \$22 of every \$100 of debt in the

hands of the public is now in the form of series E and H bonds. The growth of these holdings is not dramatic on a month-to-month basis but over the years adds up to a large amount—more than \$5 billion since January 1961 and more than \$18 billion since 1946. This record has been a tremendous assist to the debt managers and we thank you for a job well done.

The proper management of our public debt in the years ahead will require careful attention, but I think we can continue to profit by the experience of the past. The ingenuity of the various measures which have been developed reflects credit on the men charged with this responsibility, and you may be sure we will continue to profit from their wisdom and their experience. We are well aware that debt management was a serious problem not so many years ago, and we will remain constantly on the alert in the years ahead to make every effort to see that it does not become one again.

MENNONITE ORGANIZATION VIGOROUSLY AT WORK IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, daily we read of the heroic efforts of our American military personnel in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam. Today, I wish to call attention to the valiant work of the Mennonite Central Committee which, since 1954, has been quietly, yet vigorously seeking to alleviate the many health and welfare problems of the Vietnamese people. Now, the committee is again projecting new plans to meet emergency as well as long term needs.

The Mennonite Central Committee has been especially alert to the exigencies of the vastly increasing numbers of refugees who have been uprooted by the conflict in their villages and home areas. The political and military significance of such uprooted peoples, both Vietnamese and Montagnards, is of the first magnitude in the struggle against communism; and the contributions of the committee to the welfare of these peoples should not go unheralded.

It is always heartening to note such humanitarian activities by private organizations, continuing evidence of the value of our kind of society in which the creative genius of private initiative is given maximum freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that the report by the Mennonite Central Committee on their Vietnam program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MENNONITE CENTRAL COMMITTEE—VIETNAM PROGRAM

I. REVIEW OF PROGRAM

(A) MCC, the only Protestant relief agency working in Vietnam, began working in Vietnam in late 1954 following the end of the Indochina War ceasefire. The program was initially one of emergency relief and later, in cooperation with the Christian and Missionary Alliance Mission, a leprosarium was organized at Banmethuot. In 1959, MCC in cooperation with the Evangelical Church of Vietnam helped build and staff a hospital and clinic at Nhatrang.

9790

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 11, 1965

MCC relief, assistance to Vietnam, 1955-64

	Value	Weight (pounds)	U.S. commodities		Direct cash costs
			Pounds	Value	
1964	\$475,839.51	6,482,946	6,335,824	\$352,628.16	\$21,439.23
1963	261,854.07	2,699,494	2,552,040	112,016.11	15,540.72
1962	235,429.63	2,220,149	2,106,590	116,559.99	20,009.26
1961	226,841.00	2,632,877	2,526,863	149,622.22	21,630.00
1960	239,177.00	2,042,818	1,992,736	191,646.54	34,214.00
1959	111,874.00	1,246,764	1,187,164	59,984.33	32,004.00
1958	120,564.73	239,234	92,000	7,710.00	30,640.36
1957	44,375.40	66,446	35,209	16,245.16	28,904.40
1956	15,853.31	91,815	83,000	6,700.00	35,423.83
1955	156,267.74	366,977	321,626	107,933.34	12,892.63
Total	1,888,006.39	18,084,310	17,232,051	1,121,045.85	250,701.43

(B) MCC program at present:

1. Medical: Support with limited subsidy, a medical doctor and two nurses, the Evangelical hospital and clinic at Nha Trang which is serving 150 outpatients daily through the clinic, more than 25 patients in the hospital and a number of TB patients treated on an outpatient basis.

2. Distribution of supplies: In 1964 Public Law 480 commodities were distributed at the rate of 525,000 pounds per month through pastors and regional representatives in the rural areas, through institutions such as orphanages, and in the form of 162,000 loaves of bread baked and distributed in Saigon each month to schools and orphanages.

3. Family-child assistance: Projected to begin actual operation in May 1965. Will be centered in area of Saigon designated as needy by minister of social action and involves casework with a child and his family.

II. PRESENT SITUATION AND NEEDS

(A) In spite of the growing difficulties and perplexities in connection with administering a program in Vietnam because of the military involvement, the obvious only becomes more obvious; the Vietnamese people who were in need in 1954 have been reduced to even greater need in greater numbers in 1965.

1. General population: Normal communications are badly disrupted, recent natural disasters devastated certain areas robbing the people of at least one crop this year, general insecurity makes normal life routine very difficult. The result is growing poverty for many folk.

2. Refugees: These result from (1) Vietcong and (2) Vietnamese-American military actions. Now estimated at 300,000, the number of refugees is expected to grow to 600,000 soon. Refugees are pouring into the coastal provinces: (a) Vietnamese—The major attention has been directed toward the needs of this group of people because of their political significance; (b) Montagnards—Just as badly or even worse affected by military actions but largely neglected by Vietnamese Government-U.S. AID assistance.

3. Needs are both emergency and longer term.

III. EMERGENCY PROGRAM PROJECTION

In cooperation with Church World Service and in response to growing needs, MCC is planning to expand emergency assistance:

(A) For the next 12-month period we project and implement a program to meet emergency needs.

(B) This is to be done in collaboration with the Evangelical Church, determining distribution locations, establishing eligibility criteria of recipients, securing staff and facilities, and providing supervision.

(C) Program is to be centered in coastal provinces where concentrations of refugees are developing.

(D) Program should be sensitive to areas of neglect and particular groups not being adequately assisted; and provide for specialized distributions and services.

(E) Personnel—six to eight material aid field assistants and medical personnel.

(F) Budget—Initially projected at \$50,000 for 6 months.

SUMMARY OF MEDICARE TESTIMONY, MAY 11

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Finance Committee today devoted its hearings on the so-called medicare bill to testimony from the American Medical Association and five State medical associations—those of Alabama, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and Florida. I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the Record a brief summary of that testimony, prepared by my staff, in the hope that it may assist others to follow the progress of the hearings.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE FINANCE COMMITTEE, MAY 11—AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. Donovan F. Ward, president, Dubuque, Iowa:

1. Urges substitution for both basic hospital and supplemental voluntary portions the provisions of S. 820 (eldericare).

2. Objects to provision that physician must certify hospital services for payment; facility should certify that admission and care was on advice of doctor.

3. Supplemental plan should be altered to provide (a) a choice of plans; (b) State and local administration; (c) a sliding scale of income eligibility; (d) designation of insurance carriers as underwriters of any such program. These are principles of eldericare.

4. Should specify "customary charges by physicians" rather than "reasonable" costs, a word which should be deleted.

5. Urges maintenance of present provisions excluding radiologists, anesthesiologists, etc. Such professional medical services do not belong in a hospital benefits program.

6. Extended-care facility should be defined to include any nursing home accredited "as a skilled or intensive care nursing home" or meets certain American Hospital Association standards.

7. Medical assistance programs: (a) States should determine whether operation is by welfare department or health department; (b) State extension of MAA, "medically indigent, principle" to blind, disabled, and aid-to-dependent-children categories should be optional, not mandatory; (c) section 1903(e), calling for comprehensive care for all medical needy by 1975, warrants your most careful study.

8. Urges deletion of coverage for self-employed physicians.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Dr. John M. Chenault, Decatur, Ala., member State committee of public health, State board of medical examiners, board of censors of the medical association. Association has 2,200 members.

Same basic position as AMA, especially points 1, 5, and 8 above. Considers that bill

will centralize control over many aspects of care of the sick, a basic error. Use of a regressive tax for funding is also basic error. Favor expansion of MAA (Kerr-Mills) program.

PENNSYLVANIA MEDICAL SOCIETY

Dr. William E. Flannery, immediate past president, 12,000 members:

1. Favor cash benefits increase and the concept of voluntary participation of medical insurance subsidized by general fund revenues, but on the whole are opposed to the measure.

2. Regardless of age, those who are able should pay. Tax financing should be in proportion to taxpayer's ability to pay. Cash benefits are preferable to service benefits, which remove freedom to purchase that which most adequately meets individual needs.

3. Administration of medical matters should rest in the hands of those with the highest medical training and should take place at the lowest practical governmental level.

4. Specialists' services in radiology, etc., should remain in the voluntary portion rather than under hospital coverage.

ILLINOIS STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY

Dr. V. P. Siegel, East St. Louis, practicing surgeon and chairman of society's legislative committee; membership, 10,000:

Supports AMA position, stressing: (1) should omit physicians from social security coverage; (2) physician specialty services—radiology, etc.—should remain in the bill as written; (3) customary should replace reasonable—AMA point 4 above; (4) medically oriented agencies should have administrative responsibility—this is not a welfare program but a medical care program.

FLORIDA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. H. Philip Hampton, Tampa, president:

1. Requirement that welfare administration agency of State shall administer Kerr-Mills—MAA—program should be made optional.

2. Approves allowing administration of voluntary plan by an insurance carrier.

3. Approves exclusion of compensation for specialists "medical services—radiologists, etc."

4. Proposes a fund for medical education, administration, and research supported through voluntary contributions by physicians of a portion of his payments from the supplemental insurance plan, linked with a pension fund for physicians who could deposit \$3 for each \$1 of such contribution, to be treated as deferred income until paid out.

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Ralph C. Teall, M.D., Sacramento, president, 22,000 physician members:

1. Basic hospital benefits plan should be separated and considered independently. Supplementary program should be dropped entirely. If either is adopted, it should be rewritten to incorporate the concept of help related to need.

2. If enacted, both basic and supplemental programs should be modified along lines of Federal employees' health benefits program.

3. The bill should emphasize and support office, home, and outpatient care on the basis of anticipated need.

4. The bill should be amended to substitute the phrase "institutional, nonphysician providers of service" wherever the phrase "providers of service" occurs.

5. Concurs with other AMA recommendations: Removal of physicians from social security coverage; exclusion of specialist services—radiologists, etc.—as now written; substitution of customary for reasonable charges.

ADVERTISING BY THE MONARCH CONSTRUCTION CORP.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 25 of this year

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9869

Despite the magnitude of the tasks and the difficulties it presented to so many small co-ops and companies, REA telephone borrowers are making a good credit record. They have paid more than than \$165 million on their loans, including \$80 million on principal as due, about \$10 million paid ahead of schedule, and \$75 million in interest. As of the first of the year, only three of 841 borrowers were behind in their payments. There have been no foreclosures.

In my own State of Texas, the proportion of farms with telephones has gone up from about 24 percent in 1949 to 70 percent today. So far, 66 Texas borrowers have availed themselves of REA financing and already had placed in operation 407 new automatic dial exchanges to serve rural people. The loans provide service for an estimated 166,000 rural subscribers.

REA engineers and planners today are working hard on improving the quality of rural service—what they call “upgrading.” As a result of buried telephone plant and other new developments, construction costs are coming down and service is getting better. When REA began making loans, the standard was for eight parties to the line. Today the REA standard is four parties to the line and the agency already made several loans for all single-party service in rural areas. All this is a far cry from 25 parties to the line that were a commonplace on the old rural magneto line.

Today REA is continuing to work toward completion of its basic goal in the telephone program, which is to provide modern, adequate telephone service to all people in rural areas who want it. It also is committed, as it is committed in the electric program, to the objective of achieving this service for rural people under rates and conditions comparable to that available in towns and cities.

President Johnson has spoken eloquently on many occasions of his vision of a Great Society, including both rural and urban Americans. I am sure that he envisions as a part of that society an electric distribution network and a modern system of telecommunications that will stretch into every corner of this land.

I commend REA and its present Administrator, Norman M. Clapp, of Wisconsin, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, for the businesslike way in which they are going about fulfilling these important objectives and I hope that they will continue to add to their accomplishments.

THE JOHNSON PLAN FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA—A MAJOR PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in his famous speech at the Johns Hopkins University on April 7, President Johnson appealed to the people of North Vietnam to renounce the endless course of battle

as a means to the attainment of better life, and to associate themselves instead with other countries of southeast Asia in a peaceful and greatly expanded cooperative effort for development.

In a gesture indicative of his wise and generous understanding of the dire economic needs of that area, President Johnson pledged to ask the Congress to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is under way.

This was a humane and statesmanlike proposal. It provided the people of North and South Vietnam, and of the other countries of that area, with an alternative to war and a solid hope of achieving, through peaceful cooperative effort, the betterment of the human condition in southeast Asia.

Will the Johnson plan succeed in attaining its objective? We earnestly hope so. Before it can reach its goal, however, this plan must be made known to, and understood by, the people of southeast Asia.

The other day I read an interesting commentary by Mr. Henry Mayers, president of the Cold War Council, which relates to this very subject. Mr. Mayers drew a parallel between the Marshall plan and the Johnson plan, and tried to point out how the success of the former should be a guide to the implementation of the latter. The Marshall plan, in Mr. Mayers' view, succeeded in large part because the United States had the foresight and took the effort to sell it to the people of Europe, thereby winning their cooperation and active participation.

Mr. Mayers believes that a similar job of salesmanship must be performed if the Johnson plan for peace in southeast Asia is to bear fruit. And it seems to me that his argument has much to commend itself.

In our report No. 2 on ideological operations in foreign policy, issued last year, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs stressed that, in this day and age, the success of our foreign policy undertaking, depends in large part on our ability to make our objectives known to foreign audiences, to influence the attitudes of such audiences, and to motivate them to action.

We have pointed out that without proper support on the informational and psychological level, economic and military operations in the field of foreign policy run the risk of meeting with failure.

Again, in our Report No. 3 on the overseas programs of private, nonprofit American organizations, released just last week, the subcommittee has pointed out that much of the success of the private American effort abroad can be traced to the ideological image of the organizations carrying it out. In this case, in order to be effective, many of those private organizations must project and maintain a nonpolitical image.

Because of its relevance to one of the most crucial issues of our day, I wish to insert in the RECORD the pertinent part of Mr. Lee Merriman's “Editor's Diary” column which appeared in the April 21

issue of the Pasadena Independent-Star-News. The column follows:

U.S. BILLION DOLLAR AID OFFER TO SOUTHEAST ASIA CAN FAIL FOR LACK OF ADEQUATE PROPAGANDA

Old friend, Henry Mayers, father of the cold war council, is a world traveler, his interest and avocation being checking in foreign countries the effectiveness of American efforts at psychological warfare.

He sees a direct parallel between the North Vietnam reaction to the President's billion dollar Asian economic relief proposals and the Soviet reaction to the Marshall plan when first enunciated by the general back in 1947.

“Originally,” he recalled, “the Marshall plan included an offer of aid to the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. Czechoslovakia rushed to accept, but Moscow forbade all of its captive nations from participating.

“The attitude of the Hanoi regime today is identical,” he continued. “The explanation for this goes deeper than what Vietcong may still hope can be its military victory. From the Communist standpoint it is inconceivable that North Vietnam could join forces with the United States in implementing a project whose sole purpose is to create a vast area of non-Communist prosperity.”

Here Henry fell back on his parallel, comparing this problem with that of the Marshall plan's early years. Communists at first were highly successful in misrepresenting it, dubbing it an American exploitation—a U.S. takeover of Europe.

U.S. information operations in Europe were totally inadequate to overcome this. The situation grew worse until Pasadena's Paul G. Hoffman became Marshall plan administrator. He recognized quickly that his first job in Europe was selling.

A salesman himself, by ingenuity he created an organization capable of getting the show on the road in the average European's mind.

“The southeast Asian situation may be different in many respects,” Henry said, thoughtfully, “but Communist efforts to discredit the Johnson plan will be repeated.

“Red propaganda could prove a greater hindrance to U.S. objectives there in 1965 than it was in Europe in 1947.

“Today's U.S. Information Agency is now far more experienced, but it is still handicapped by American under-rating of the part propaganda can play in either hot or cold war.”

This Johnson plan he rates as an astute piece of American statesmanship, welcome cold war initiative. He thinks its objectives will be adequately communicated to South Vietnam farmers, thereby making an immediate contribution to the political war effort against the Vietcong.

But if the President's offer can also be registered in the minds of the North Vietnam masses, it may prove a major psychological weapon. If it can also be sold by competent, adequately financed propaganda directed to the masses of Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia, the Johnson plan may live up to its sponsor's objectives.

CAB FINDINGS SUPPORT CHARGES OF FAA IRRESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, radar air traffic control facilities were not designed to give FAA employees ringside seats to passively observe near-misses and midair collisions. Yet, apparently

the Federal Aviation Agency under Najeeb Halaby condones and encourages this amazing and shocking practice. This is the full and unmistakable import of the revelations made at the CAB hearings into the Eastern Air Lines crash of February 8 being conducted in New York City this week of a recent exchange of letters between the CAB and the FAA, and of a recent CAB report of another near-miss incident.

It will be recalled that on March 15 I took the floor of the House to discuss the crash of February 8 and to sharply criticize the role of the FAA Administrator in the events leading up to and following the tragedy in which 84 persons were killed. During that speech, as well as on previous occasions, I charged that the FAA Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, was running a sloppy and mismanaged program of air traffic safety. I further charged that the FAA Administrator had invaded the jurisdiction of the CAB, which is authorized under law to investigate all air crashes, and that it was attempting to cast a smokescreen over its own responsibilities for bringing about the near-miss involved in the February 8 crash. I stated in my March 15 speech:

There is some likelihood that the two planes had a near miss, that to avoid a collision the Eastern banked sharply away from the Pan American, and that somehow the Eastern could not emerge from the turn and it crashed into the sea.

This likelihood was supported by the statements of the pilots of the Pan American airliner who saw the Eastern dive into the sea and from the evidence that the two planes were headed toward each other in the dead of night at approximately the same altitudes at the time of the crash.

But, Halaby zooming onto the scene, the FAA quickly denied any possibility of a near-miss, insisted that the planes were vertically separated by at least 1,000 feet—the minimum legal separation—and horizontally separated by 3 miles. Halaby then increased the vertical separation to 1,700 feet. Testimony received by the CAB this week flatly contradicts these self-serving statements by the FAA. This testimony revealed the following facts:

First. The Eastern and the Pan American came within 200 to 500 feet of each other. One of the Pan American pilots testified that the Eastern "seemed to be diving down straight at us."

Second. An FAA controller saw the radar images of the two planes merge on his screen.

Third. A detailed examination of the wreckage revealed no preimpact failure of the aircraft structure, engines, or systems.

Thus in the testimony received so far the FAA statements that the planes were vertically separated by from 1,000 to 1,700 feet has been shown to be without foundation. In fact, the planes were within 200 to 500 feet, according to the eyewitness testimony of two pilots trained to observe such things. Similarly, the FAA statements that the planes were horizontally separated by 3 miles has been shown to be utterly untrue. One plane not only flew directly over the

other, but an FAA controller has admitted that he saw the two merge on his radar screen. When planes merge on a radar screen there can be no appreciable horizontal separation.

Most of these facts were apparent from the initial statements and releases of information made during the first week following the February 8 crash. It is understandable, therefore, that the CAB, which is authorized by statute to investigate aviation accidents to determine the facts and the probable causes, would be concerned. The CAB is also authorized by statute to make recommendations to the FAA for the purpose of preventing accidents. On March 30, 1965, the CAB made its first recommendation to the FAA as a result of the February 8 crash. In a letter to the FAA the CAB's Bureau of Safety recommended that the terminal area traffic control procedures be changed so that two aircraft may not be convergent, or nearly identical tracks, when they are climbing or descending toward each other. The letter from the CAB states in part:

We are concerned with radar air traffic control procedures used by controller personnel that we believe to be inconsistent with safe operating procedures. We refer specifically to the procedure in which two aircraft are placed on convergent courses or near identical tracks at a time when they are climbing and/or descending toward each other in the terminal area.

The reason for this concern on the part of the CAB is that when two planes are climbing or descending, or where one is climbing and the other is descending, toward each other it is difficult for the pilots to judge whether any vertical separation exists, even when they observe the other aircraft and are advised of the relative altitudes. This is particularly true at night and near terminal areas. And these are precisely the circumstances surrounding the February 8 tragedy. The CAB in its letter goes on to state that in response to this situation, when the pilot of a plane traveling toward another plane cannot tell whether there is any vertical separation between the two, there may be an avoidance maneuver to escape a collision that only appears imminent. This, says the CAB, could result in a greater possibility of collision.

The CAB then sets out two specific recommendations in its message to the FAA:

(a) When radar services are provided to known IFR departing and arriving traffic in terminal areas, divergent track separation be provided; and

(b) That climb or descent headings shall not be assigned which would result in track divergence between inbound and outbound aircraft on the order of less than 30°.

In other words, the CAB definitely believes that two planes, inbound and outbound from an airport, should not be placed on courses which will cause one to fly over the other unless there is at least a 30° divergence. In view of the February 8 crash, when one airliner did fly directly over the other and in which a near-miss did play some part, such a safety requirement seems to me to be entirely reasonable.

In this light, the response of the FAA

to the CAB's recommendations is enlightening. The FAA in its reply dated April 14, 1965, summarily dismissed the recommendation of the CAB. Cocksure and arrogant as ever, the FAA under the leadership of Najeeb Halaby, replied in its letter:

We firmly believe that our current procedures are adequate and consistent with safe operating procedures. Since we can see no justification for any change, we propose to take no further action on your recommendation at this time.

This, in my judgment, is an intolerable situation. The CAB is attempting to diligently perform its statutory duty to investigate air collisions and make such recommendations to the Administrator of the FAA as will tend to prevent similar accidents in the future. The overall objective of the law in this respect is, of course, to improve aviation safety. But Halaby is frustrating and opposing the CAB and defeating the goal of aviation safety by the rigid and inflexible position he has taken.

As if the evidence that demonstrates the incorrectness of Halaby's position is not weighty enough, over the weekend still another instance of a near-miss brought about by FAA procedures has come to light. The CAB issued a report on Saturday, May 8, blaming the FAA for putting two planes on a collision course over Springfield, Va., last September. According to the CAB report, an FAA control center was directing the planes in cloudy weather, but it failed to provide adequate separation between the planes and failed to warn either plane of the other's presence. One of the planes was a United Air Lines Viscount with 42 persons aboard. It was descending for a landing at National Airport when the incident occurred. Had the alert pilot of the Viscount not seen the other plane and suddenly pulled his plane up, the two planes would have collided in a matter of seconds. As a result of this evasive maneuver the lives of everyone aboard the planes were saved, although two stewardesses were injured.

Mr. Speaker, when I stated on March 15 that there was a near-miss involved in the February 8 crash of the Eastern airliner near New York, and that the FAA Administrator had some responsibility for it and that the FAA Administrator has been responsible for many near-misses in the past, I was met with a good deal of criticism. I was told that such a charge could not be true. But the charges I made on March 15 were true in every detail. In fact, if anything, I understated the case. For I would not have believed that even Najeeb Halaby would be so stubborn and unwilling to admit a mistake that when requested by the CAB to change an air traffic procedure for the sake of greater safety and the prevention of air collisions, he would summarily refuse. I would not have believed that rather than comply with a CAB request for greater air safety he would stick to his old outdated traffic procedures. I would not have believed that any person would be so callous and indifferent to the welfare of the general public that rather than admit a mistake the FAA Administrator would cause his

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9871

agency to retain an obsolete and outmoded air traffic procedure which could have well caused the deaths of 84 persons.

Still, I have been criticizing the FAA and Najeeb Halaby for 3 years because the ineptness of his administration and the dangers to the flying public have been obvious to me. I have seen the rigidity and the indifference of the FAA operate in my own district where Halaby has ordered the abandonment of a new FAA Air Traffic Control Center. The unreasonableness of Halaby now threatens the safety of my constituents and all persons who fly in the San Antonio area. For if the San Antonio center is in fact abandoned and closed, I could not assure the public that the excellent air safety record of this area would continue. If this center is in fact closed I could not assure the public that the excellent air safety record of this area would continue. If this center is in fact closed down, I will pray to God that I am wrong.

But I do not want to be proved right by the twisted, smoking metal and the charred, indistinguishable bodies of an aircraft collision. For this reason, I am asking the new Administrator of the FAA to completely reexamine the decision to close the San Antonio center. I am confident that when the facts are scrutinized Halaby will be proved wrong again.

It is true that Halaby has been replaced as FAA Administrator. Now we have to get rid of Halabyism as well.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record four stories from the New York Times reporting the CAB hearings into the February 8 crash, dated May 5, May 6, May 7, and May 8, written by Edward Hudson; copies of the letter from the CAB to the FAA dated March 30, and the FAA reply dated April 14; a story from Aviation Daily commenting on the two letters dated May 6; and a story from the Sunday Star reporting the CAB report on the near-collision over Springfield, Va., dated May 9:

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1965]
PILOT CITES DIVE BY DOOMED PLANE—PAN AM CAPTAIN TESTIFIES ON CRASH THAT KILLED 84

(By Edward Hudson)

An Eastern Air Lines DC-7B that crashed off Jones Beach on February 8, killing all 84 aboard, came within 200 to 500 feet of a Pan American jetliner and "seemed to be diving down straight at us, the pilot of the Pan American plane testified yesterday.

The pilot, Capt. Robert A. Marshall, of Miami, was one of six witnesses who testified on the opening day of hearings by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the cause of the tragedy. The hearings, which are scheduled to last through Friday, are being held in the building of the United States Mission to the United Nations, at 799 United Nations Plaza.

The Eastern plane plunged into the Atlantic Ocean 6.7 miles south-southeast of Jones Inlet at 6:27 p.m., 7 minutes after takeoff from Kennedy International Airport. The plane was en route from Boston to Atlanta. Its next stop was to have been Richmond, Va.

Taped radio conversations released shortly after the accident had indicated a near-miss. While one Pan American pilot reported that "we had a close miss here," a second stated: "He was well over the top of us. And it looked as though he went into an absolute vertical turn and kept rolling."

EVASIVE MANEUVER SHOWN

The idea that close call had indeed been experienced by the two planes was given further weight at yesterday's hearing by Captain Marshall's description of the encounter, and by evidence of an evasive maneuver shown by the Pan American jet's flight recorder.

Furthermore, a CAB statement introduced in evidence reported that an unidentified air traffic controller who had been guiding the Pan American jet at one point saw the radar images of the two planes merge on his screen.

The merging of two targets is by itself not necessarily an indication that a collision is imminent since planes can be at different altitudes. However, the controller's report did conflict with Federal Aviation Agency reports just after the crash that its controllers had not seen the planes closer than 3 miles.

The vital question that remained unanswered yesterday was this: If the Eastern plane did descend toward the Pan American jet, what caused it to do so rather than continue its climb on its outbound journey?

At the time the Pan American jet was inbound toward Kennedy Airport and descending. It was night and though both planes were guided by radar controllers on the ground, each had been told of the other's presence and had acknowledged seeing each other.

The CAB's Investigator-in-charge, William L. Lamb, testified that a detailed examination of the wreckage, of which 62 percent was recovered by divers, revealed no pre-impact failure of the aircraft structure, engines or systems. Medical histories of the Eastern crew showed all had been in good health at their last examinations.

'DISORIENTATION' A POSSIBILITY

Experts raised the possibility that the Eastern pilot, Capt. Frederick R. Carson, had become disoriented, had mistakenly believed that the Pan American jet was at his altitude and had dived to avoid the jet. One pilot testified there was no horizon visible that night.

The Civil Aeronautics Board announced it would conduct a study of such "spatial disorientation." The results will be entered into the record at a later date.

It was also disclosed that the Board had expressed concern about the Federal Aviation Agency's radar air-traffic-control procedures, in a letter dated March 30. The letter was not made public.

The hearing here will resume at 9:30 a.m. today. G. Joseph Minetti, of the CAB, is presiding.

[From the New York Times, May 6, 1965]
CRASH SPURS A BID FOR NEW AIR RULE—CAB WOULD END VERTICAL PASSING IN AIRPORT AREAS

(By Edward Hudson)

A change of air traffic rules, apparently prompted by the crash of an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B off Jones Beach last February 8, has been recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Federal Aviation Agency.

But the FAA, which operates the air traffic system, has refused to make the change and has told the CAB which is investigating the crash that current procedures are adequate and consistent with safe operating practices.

The CAB, in a letter to the FAA dated last March 30, recommended that the FAA abandon a procedure that allows an outbound plane in an airport area to climb over the path of a descending inbound plane.

This corresponds roughly to the traffic pattern in the Eastern accident. The Eastern propeller plane, outbound from Kennedy International Airport, was steered by FAA radar controllers from an easterly to a southerly heading—in the general direction of a descending inbound Pan American jet.

The letter, from B. R. Allen, director of the CAB Bureau of Safety, to Clifford P. Burton, acting director of the FAA's Air Traffic Service, was made public by the CAB during the second day of hearings by that agency into the cause of the Eastern crash. An FAA lawyer had referred to the letter on the first day of the hearing and reporters had asked for copies.

The Eastern plane, bound for Richmond, Va., plunged into the Atlantic Ocean 7½ miles south of Jones Inlet, killing all 84 occupants aboard. A minute or so before the crash, according to the Pan American crew, the Eastern craft crossed the jet's path in a near-vertical right bank, coming so close that it caused the two jet pilots to fear a collision.

The jet pilots both said they saw a "rapid deterioration" of the Eastern craft's altitude seconds before the reported near miss. No evidence has been introduced yet in the hearings to explain why the Eastern plane fell.

However, pilot representatives have questioned whether the Eastern crew, seeing the lights of the Pan American jet at twilight, were deceived into thinking the jet was at their altitude and reacted by diving.

A Braniff pilot testified Tuesday that a right turn under such circumstances would make another craft off to the right appear to be above him rather than below.

This still would not explain how the Eastern craft wound up in the ocean. One participant in the hearing speculated privately that the Eastern craft, already banked on one wing, might have been caught in the turbulence of the jet's wake and thrown out of control, from which it could not recover in 3,000 feet.

The CAB had announced at the hearing's start that it would study sensory illusions by pilots at night.

In its letter the agency said that pilots often found it difficult to judge vertical separation when they were on opposing courses—with one plane descending and the other climbing—particularly in an airport area at night.

"The response to this situation," it said, "may be an avoidance maneuver to escape a collision that only appears imminent, although altitude separation exists."

The CAB closely questioned FAA witnesses yesterday on whether proper and sufficient guidance had been given the two planes.

The letter, from B. R. Allen, Director of the CAB Bureau of Safety, to Clifford P. Burton, Acting Director of the FAA's Air Traffic Service, was made public by the CAB during the second day of hearings by that agency into the cause of the Eastern crash. An FAA lawyer had referred to the letter on the first day of the hearing and reporters had asked for copies.

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1965]
TWO DIFFER ON PATH OF DC-7 IN CRASH—TRAFFIC TESTIMONY FOLLOWS PILOT REPORT OF NEAR-MISS

(By Edward Hudson)

Two air traffic controllers who were on duty when an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B crashed last February 8 off Jones Beach made conflicting statements yesterday on the relative flight paths of the Eastern plane and a Pan American jet just before the crash.

The pilot of the Pan American jet has told of a close miss with the Eastern craft a minute or so before the DC-7B plunged into the Atlantic Ocean, killing all 84 occupants on board. He said the DC-7B went by in a near vertical right bank, only 200 to 500 feet away.

The discrepancy in controller statements bears on the question of whether adequate separation was being provided for the planes by Federal Aviation Agency traffic controllers. The rules require 1,000 feet vertical separation or 3 miles horizontal.

While one radar controller said he had guided the Eastern craft to pass to the

9872

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 11, 1965

east of the Pan Am jet, a second radar controller said he saw the Eastern craft to the west of the jet. It had previously been brought out that the second controller had seen the radar targets of the two craft touch.

THIRD DAY OF INQUIRY

The conflicting versions emerged on the third day of a Civil Aeronautics Board inquiry into the disaster.

Statements by several other controllers during the hearings coincided with that of the first controller, Peter Angelone, who was guiding Eastern on its outbound journey from Kennedy International Airport.

The conflicting observation by the second controller, John D. Zagami, supported a contention by the pilot and copilot of the inbound Pan American jet that the Eastern plane was to the west of the jet as it came toward it after turning.

Mr. Zagami was to have been the next controller in line to take control of Eastern. However, the Eastern crew made no radio contact with Mr. Zagami. The plane plunged into the ocean less than 2 minutes after the crew had signed off its radio conversation with the first controller.

Mr. Angelone said he had guided the Eastern airliner into a turn from east to south after it had crossed the "bow" of the Pan Am jet, which was northwestward to Kennedy. He said he could not recall seeing the Eastern plane complete the turn, but he last remembered it 4 miles east of the jet.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1965]
PERIL IN JET WAKE NOTED AT INQUIRY—
EAL INSTRUCTOR PILOT GIVES VIEW AT
CRASH HEARING

(By Edward Hudson)

An instructor pilot of Eastern Air Lines testified yesterday that there was "a good possibility" he could lose control of a plane if he were to fly through the turbulent wake of a jet while in an extreme bank.

The testimony by Robert S. Kraskey, Eastern's manager of flying, came on the fourth and final day of hearings into the crash last February 8 of an Eastern DC-7B propeller craft off Jones Beach. All 86 aboard died.

A minute or so before the crash the DC-7B apparently had a close miss with a Pan American jet on a nearly opposite course. The jet's two pilots have stated that they took evasive action to avoid the DC-7B as it passed 200 to 500 feet overhead in a vertical bank, slightly nose down.

Both jet pilots said they had feared the DC-7B would strike their craft. They said the Eastern plane had appeared to lose altitude just before the encounter.

NEAR MISS EMPHASIZED

As the Civil Aeronautics Board hearings ended, it became apparent that the investigating agency's primary interest had been the reported near miss and why it occurred. The questioning of 2 dozen witnesses delved almost exclusively in this area.

At the hearing's outset, G. Joseph Minetti, a CAB member, appeared to rule out mechanical trouble. He said recovered DC-7B wreckage had shown no preimpact failure of structures, engines, or systems of the plane.

At the time of the alleged near miss, it was dark, the weather was relatively clear and Eastern had just returned right from an easterly to a southerly heading. Pan Am had been flying north northwest. Both planes had been guided by radar controllers and had acknowledged seeing each other.

Eastern was outbound from Kennedy International Airport and Pan Am was inbound.

One of the major mysteries is how the two planes could come so close in altitude. Eastern's last altitude report, just before its last turn, was that it was "out of 3,700" feet in its climb. Members of the Pan Am crew indi-

cated that the midair encounter took place at 8,000 feet, and the jet's flight recorder indicated sharp maneuvers at this level.

THEORY OF ILLUSION

Did the Eastern pilots have an optical illusion that Pan Am's lights were at or above them and dive instead of continuing a climb? A major study of such illusions has been begun by the CAB, it was announced at the hearing.

Another question is: Why was there not horizontal separation? A radar controller who guided Eastern said he had seen Eastern go safely across Pan Am's bow and turn right, winding up 4 miles east of the jet and, at his last glance, moving away from the latter craft.

A second radar controller has testified, however, that he saw Eastern's and Pan Am's radar targets meet on his scope, with Eastern slightly to the west of Pan Am.

The Pan Am pilot, Capt. Robert A. Marshall, was questioned closely as to whether he had delayed for 55 seconds a 20° turn to the left given by a controller less than a minute before the apparent close miss. Captain Marshall never admitted a delay but said any maneuver he had flown was to separate the two planes more.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1965.

Mr. B. R. ALLEN,
Director, Bureau of Safety,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: This is in reply to your letter dated March 30, 1965, regarding radar air traffic control procedures.

We do not concur in the recommendations contained in your letter. After thoroughly reviewing your comments we do not agree that the proposal would not derogate air traffic control efficiency. On the contrary, it would have an adverse impact on our overall method of providing radar air traffic control services, as well as significantly reducing the capacity of the system.

We firmly believe that our current procedures are adequate and consistent with safe operating practices. Since we can see no justification for any change, we propose to take no further action on your recommendation at this time.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD P. BURTON,
Acting Director, Air Traffic Service.

MARCH 30, 1965.

Mr. CLIFFORD P. BURTON,
Acting Director, Air Traffic Service, Federal
Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURTON: Relative to your telephone conversation with the Chief of our Operations Division, Mr. Joseph C. Zacko, on March 29, 1965, we would like to elaborate further on the subject of radar air traffic control procedures. We are concerned with radar air traffic control procedures used by controller personnel that we believe to be inconsistent with safe operating practices. We refer specifically to the procedure in which two aircraft are placed on convergent courses or near identical tracks at a time when they are climbing and/or descending toward each other in the terminal area. In a situation in which one aircraft is in climb attitude and the other in descent attitude, it is often difficult for pilots to judge whether vertical separation does or does not exist, even though they observe the other aircraft and are advised by ATC of the relative altitudes. This problem is particularly acute in the terminal area during nighttime operations, and is compounded when either or both aircraft turn on the landing lights for identification purposes.

The response to this situation may be an avoidance maneuver to escape a collision that only appears imminent, although altitude

separation exists. This could result in a greater possibility of collision. In addition, the practice of placing two aircraft moving in a vertical plane on the same, or nearly the same, track in opposing directions, under visual flight conditions, sets up the possibility of loss of control of personal injury if for any reason one of the aircraft executes an unexpected maneuver for apparent collision avoidance.

It is the Board's belief that these potentially hazardous situations can be eliminated with little or no derogation of air traffic control efficiency, since the altitude levels of known IFR traffic in terminal areas are not extensive and the control of both the outbound and inbound traffic is vested in the same control facility. Exchange of information and coordination between the departure controller and the arrival controller, therefore, should not be difficult or burdensome.

Accordingly, the Board recommends that (a) when radar services are provided to known IFR departing and arriving traffic in terminal areas, divergent track separation be provided, and (b) that climb or descent headings shall not be assigned which would result in track divergence between inbound and outbound aircraft on the order of less than 30°.

Sincerely yours,

MARION F. ROSCOE
(For B. R. Allen,
Director, Bureau of Safety).

[From Aviation Daily, May 6, 1965]

ATC PROCEDURE MAY HAVE LED TO FATAL EAL
CRASH, CAB IMPLIES

FAA's air traffic control procedures may have set up an apparent-collision situation which led to the crash of an airliner in New York in February, a letter from CAB to FAA implies.

The March 30 letter from CAB's Bureau of Safety, made public yesterday, recommended that FAA change the terminal area traffic control procedure in which two aircraft are placed on convergent courses, or near-identical tracks, when they are climbing and/or descending toward each other. The recommendation, rejected by FAA, grew out of CAB's investigation of the February 8 crash of an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B which killed all 84 persons aboard.

When one plane is climbing and the other descending, CAB said in the letter, "it is often difficult for pilots to judge whether vertical separation does or does not exist even though they observe other aircraft and are advised by air traffic control of relative altitudes * * *". The response to this situation may be an avoidance maneuver to escape a collision that only appears imminent * * *. This could result in greater possibility of collision * * *. In addition, the practice * * * sets up the possibility of loss of control if * * * one of the aircraft executes an unexpected maneuver for apparent collision avoidance."

The letter, and FAA's reply dismissing the suggestion, were made public yesterday at CAB hearings in New York.

Testimony at the hearing has reinforced reports immediately after the accident that the Eastern pilot pulled up sharply to avoid a nearby jet, then lost control of his aircraft.

CAB's letter, signed by Marion F. Roscoe, Deputy Director of the Board's Bureau of Safety, and addressed to Clifford P. Burton, acting director of FAA's Air Traffic Service, said "It is the Board's belief that these potentially hazardous situations can be eliminated with little or no derogation of air traffic control efficiency."

The Board recommended specifically that "when radar services are provided to known IFR departing and arriving traffic in terminal areas, divergent track separation be provided and climb or descent headings not be assigned which would result in track diver-

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9873

gence between inbound and outbound aircraft on the order of less than 30 degrees."

"We do not agree that the proposal would not derogate air traffic control efficiency," Burton said in an April 14 reply. "It would have an adverse impact on our overall method of providing radar ATC services, as well as significantly reducing the capacity of the system. We firmly believe that our current procedures are adequate and consistent with safe operating practices. Since we can see no justification for any change, we propose to take no further action on your recommendation at this time."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 9, 1965]

NEAR-MISS BY TWO PLANES BLAMED ON CONTROL UNIT

The Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday blamed the Federal Aviation Agency's control center here for putting two planes, one with two persons aboard, on a collision course over Springfield, Va., last September. The CAB said the control center was directing both planes in cloudy weather.

The center, CAB said, not only failed to provide adequate separation between planes but also failed to warn either plane of the other's presence.

George L. Donnahoo, of 724 Pinehurst Avenue, Fairfax, Va., was the pilot of the larger plane, a United Air Lines Viscount descending for landing at National Airport with 42 aboard.

TWO STEWARDESSES HURT

Seeing a light military plane ahead, he suddenly pulled the Viscount up, causing serious injury to two stewardesses.

The CAB said calculations indicate the two planes were closing at about 385 miles per hour and would have hit within a minute, the Associated Press reported.

The other plane—whose identity remained a mystery in the initial reports of the near miss—was listed in the CAB report as an Air Force light twin engine plane flying from Andrews Air Force Base to Dulles International Airport at 3,000 feet.

NO INDICATION ON RADAR

The CAB said the FAA center failed to warn the planes because the center's radar did not show the danger. Present systems do not indicate the altitudes of planes directly to the control center.

A United Air Lines spokesman said the stewardesses injured were Valerie Whittington, who lived in the Washington area, and now is married and Carla Burns, of Pittsburgh. Miss Whittington's back was injured. Miss Burns is working as a United stewardess again.

"LET KING GO TOO FAR," JOHNSON TELLS SENATORS

(Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, there have been few occasions on which the President and I have agreed on the subject of the behavior of Martin Luther King, but when he recently commented that he had let him go too far, he struck a responsive chord with me. I would hope that this statement, recorded in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of April 19, 1965, means that the administration plans to take back some of the free rein it has allowed King to have in the past. If so, it is a long overdue and a welcome move.

With unanimous consent, I would like to insert the story telling of the President's change of heart:

"LET KING GO TOO FAR," JOHNSON TELLS SENATORS

(By Sarah McClendon)

WASHINGTON.—President Lyndon B. Johnson, in talking with Senators at the White House a few days ago (April 13), said "I let Martin Luther King go too far."

The remark, made in the presence of some southern Senators, astounded them.

Some in the audience said they did not hear it. Others well noted it.

At the time, the President was reportedly talking about entirely different matters.

The almost aside remark came as he was discussing Vietnam, telling how he did not like to be pressured, and would not submit to it.

"FOREIGN AID HELPS PEOPLE—NOT GOVERNMENTS"

(Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, judging by the tenor of the letters which I continue to receive, in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, there are still those who apparently think that foreign aid means sending bales of money to foreign governments.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

In the first place, we do not send money in today's foreign aid program. We send American-made goods and services—goods and services which the developing countries need to get on their own feet—things like DDT for malaria control, farm equipment, generators for electric power, bulldozers for roadbuilding, schoolteachers, technicians, and agriculture experts.

In the second place, our foreign aid program is not basically designed to help other governments. It is designed to help other people.

When we talk about aid, we are not talking about dollars or foreign governments.

We are talking about ways to help the people of other lands learn better ways of building things, better ways of growing things, better ways of educating their children, better ways of improving public health, better ways of public administration—and in general, better ways of living.

Foreign aid deals with people, down-to-earth problems, and practical solutions.

AID technicians all over the world are sharing American know-how with the people of the developing countries:

Like Charlie "Chicken" Davis who helped the people of Nigeria learn better ways of producing chickens and eggs, bringing about a major advance in the country's economy.

Like Nasser Lateef who worked with the people of Tunisia to develop improved methods of horticulture which have revolutionized the tomato paste industry of that country.

Like Edgar "Pop" Buell who has helped the people of Laos learn better methods

of raising crops, building schools, and irrigating their farms.

Like Paul Zehngraff whose work with the people of West Pakistan in planting trees, rather than crops, on the skimpy mountainsides resulted in a thriving timber industry.

Like Paul Foster, an AID housing planner in Peru, whose work with the people in that country to establish savings and loan institutions have enabled thousands of workers to own their own homes.

Like Earl Brockman whose work with the people of Vietnam has resulted in putting some 35,000 families in the pig-raising business.

And like another AID technician whose work with the people of Korea resulted in efficient, economical rat control methods which saved thousands of tons of grain for Korean farmers.

These are just a few of the unsung heroes of our foreign aid program—American technicians who are working daily side by side with the people of the recipient countries to improve their methods of doing things, to help them meet their own needs in better ways. Technical assistance is AID's primary instrument for the development of human resources and skills.

There are other examples of how foreign aid meets the needs of people.

In Latin America, surplus agricultural commodities from the United States are being used to feed some 10 million schoolchildren through the Operation Ninos program of the Alliance for Progress.

The number of children and adults learning to read and write and acquiring skills through AID assistance runs into the millions.

Foreign aid is also helping to eradicate malaria, measles, and other diseases throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, as a direct result of our people-to-people foreign aid program, in the last 3 years alone, we have erected 280,000 hospitals and health centers, built or improved 120,000 miles of roads, and established 110,000 wells and water systems.

This is truly aid to people in the fulfillment of their hopes and dreams for a better world. And, it is a wise investment in our own security. Our foreign aid program offers irrefutable argument that the United States is interested in the welfare of people who need assistance.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT 41ST ANNUAL MOTHER'S DAY SERVICES AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 9, the American War Mothers held their 41st annual Mother's Day services at Arlington National Cemetery. The program, as usual, was inspiring, and brought back vividly to mind

the sacrifices made in the best traditions of patriotism during all our history, and particularly in the current century. The mothers in attendance at Arlington last Sunday represent the strongest force looking toward the establishment of a perpetual peace that will make further sacrifices unnecessary.

The program was participated in by various agencies of the National Government. The principal address of the day was delivered by the Honorable JAMES KEE, Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia. Our friend and colleague is the third member of a distinguished family to be chosen to represent the citizens of West Virginia in the Halls of Congress, and his address on Sunday shows why he is so popular among those who know him. It was eloquent and at the same time forceful, and was received with evident appreciation and enjoyment by his audience. I believe the Members of the House would find it more than usually impressive, and I therefore insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA, ON THE 41ST ANNUAL MOTHER'S DAY SERVICES ON MAY 9 AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, CONDUCTED BY THE AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

Madam Chairman, General Johnson, members of other national patriotic organizations, especially the national guard of honor of the American Legion and the national honor guard of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and most important, members of the American War Mothers, and distinguished guests all, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to substitute for the honorable Harley O. Stagers, the distinguished dean of our West Virginia congressional delegation, and it is an honor to join with you on this 41st annual Mother's Day ceremony.

Of the 339 organizations chartered by a special act of Congress, including the first charter issued in the year 1791, I know of none which has so completely justified this confidence as has the American War Mothers.

It is appropriate that we recognize those mothers—mothers of men and women who have served and are serving in our Armed Forces.

Especially should we remember those wonderful mothers who founded the American War Mothers on September 29, 1917.

We should also remember Mr. Frank Herren, affectionately known as "the father of Mother's Day," who arranged for your first observance of Mother's Day here at Arlington National Cemetery in 1924, as a tribute to beloved children whose lives had been lost in the service of their country.

We should, again, thank those whose unselfish efforts resulted in obtaining your congressional charter on February 24, 1925.

It is entirely fitting and proper that we assemble here on these hallowed grounds, the final resting place of our servicemen and our servicewomen, who have now gone to their eternal reward—those who gave their lives in service in order that American can continue to move forward for the benefit of the generations yet to come.

Because of their supreme sacrifice, Madam Chairman, we are all here today to pay respectful tribute to your 20,000 mothers, including the 1,874 Gold Star Mothers who are members of your organization.

As we look back through the pages of our own history, we find as of October 7, 1964, a total of 31,453,000 participants in all of our nine wars, with 972,000 deaths in service.

Today we have 45,000 military personnel on duty in South Vietnam with 360 known fatalities from hostile forces.

In the Dominican Republic we have 20,000 military personnel on duty with 12 known fatalities.

Within the past half-century, the United States has found it necessary to become an active participant in the two greatest wars in the history of the human race—the First World War and the Second World War.

When the guns had ceased sounding in World War II, the civilized nations of the earth joined together in forming the United Nations in the hope that after centuries of bloodshed, mankind could find a substitute for armed conflict in the settlement of disputes between nations. Yet, less than 5 years after this pact was signed, the United States found itself engaged in a bitter war against Communist aggression in far-off Korea—a conflict brought on because the Communist nations cynically violated their pledge in the United Nations to respect the rights of other countries.

And now again, as these ceremonies are being held, American lives and American dollars are helping a friendly nation to fight off another vicious Communist aggression in the far Pacific—this time in Vietnam.

Thus the record shows four wars in less than half a century. What common thread runs through all these conflicts? The answer is, That not one of these wars was of our making. The United States has not been guilty of a single act of aggression or wrongdoing that helped to bring on World War I, or World War II, or the war in Korea, or the present ugly struggle in Vietnam. Our country fought in these wars because liberty was at stake. It fought to preserve the liberty of its own people and the liberty of all peace-loving peoples on this globe.

The war in Vietnam is just as much a struggle against tyranny as was the war against Hitler and Mussolini and the war lords of Japan. We entered this struggle because we had given our pledge to help the friendly people of South Vietnam to preserve their liberties against unjustified attack. This was the motive which inspired the sending of American troops to Vietnam by former President Eisenhower, the sending of more troops by the late President Kennedy, and the sending of still more troops by President Johnson. Our word of honor is at stake in Vietnam and our people and our Government believe in the sacredness of our word of honor.

Why are American soldiers in Vietnam? The best answer to this was given by President Johnson in his recent message to Congress asking for more funds to support our forces there—an explanation so eloquent that I quote a part of this historic message:

"In 1954 we signed the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. That treaty committed us to act to meet aggression against South Vietnam. The U.S. Senate ratified that treaty and that obligation by a vote of 82 to 1.

"Less than a year ago the Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, said that the United States was ready to take all necessary steps to meet its obligations under that treaty.

"That resolution of the Congress expressed support for the policies of the administration to help the people of South Vietnam against attack—a policy established by two previous presidents.

"Thus we cannot, and will not, withdraw or be defeated. The stakes are too high, the commitment too deep, the lessons of history too plain.

"At every turning point in the last 30 years, there have been those who opposed a firm stand against aggression. They have always been wrong. And when we heeded their cries, when we gave in, the consequence has been more bloodshed and wider war.

"We will not repeat that mistake. Nor will we heed those who urge us to use our

great power in a reckless or a casual manner. We have no desire to expand the conflict. We will do what must be done. And we will do only what must be done."

Last week the Congress clearly affirmed the resolve of the American people.

Those of us participating in these ceremonies today are grateful to our country because of the abundant life we are able to enjoy in this land of the free. But we are even more proud of our spiritual heritage of the fact that as President Johnson said we believe that our pledge is a debt of honor. We promised our partners in democracy to aid them against aggression. That pledge is now being redeemed.

The great significance of Mother's Day is emphasized by the fact that within a few short decades, it has come to occupy a place alongside Christmas, the Fourth of July, and Thanksgiving in the calendar of America's consecrated days. It is an observance frankly based on sentiment, in fact, the most sacred sentiment that may be found in the heart of a human being. The man or woman who cannot recall the warm love of a devoted mother has lost their most precious part of the human heritage.

The United States is strong in its manpower and strong in its material resources, but the major source of its strength is the love and loyalty of its millions of citizens. This meeting here today has a deeper purpose than a mere gathering together to pay tribute to the war mothers of America or to hear once again the glorious story of America's past. The purpose of this gathering is to re-light once again the sacred flame of patriotism—to remind both ourselves and our fellow citizens of the high duty involved in love of country.

The fact that you have presented a special award in honor of our country's military serving in South Vietnam to Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff, clearly demonstrates our obligation to those to whom we owe our entire future as a nation.

Since its humble beginnings nearly two centuries ago, this Nation has been able to grow and prosper because in each generation there have been men and women willing to sacrifice their lives and their fortunes to insure its preservation. May it always be so. May we hope that for untold centuries devoted citizens will gather each year in this hallowed place to renew once again their pledge of love and loyalty to our country. May we hope that the observance of Mother's Day will continue as long as life exists on this planet.

In conclusion, I believe that Pat O'Reilly had each of you in mind in writing the poem, "A Wonderful Mother." I believe this poem expresses the gratitude held as close and dear by a grateful nation:

"A WONDERFUL MOTHER

"God made a wonderful mother,
A mother who never grows old;
He made her smile of the sunshine,
And he molded her heart of pure gold;
In her eyes he placed bright shining stars,
In her cheeks, fair roses you see;
God made a wonderful mother,
And he gave that dear mother to me."
—PAT O'REILLY.

ELLIS ISLAND IS ADDED TO STATUE OF LIBERTY MONUMENT

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from the White House where I watched President Johnson sign

Mr. Speaker, does this charge bear out the advertisement's statement that the committee—of which Mr. Davis is co-chairman—and the members of it desired to "safeguard an employee's right to make a free choice regarding union membership"?

Third, did Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., illegally interrogate employees as to their desire for a union? The U.S. court of appeals says it did, and that it should not have interfered in—

Matters of union membership (discussion of) the nature of extent of union activity, or (the dissuasion of) employees from joining or remaining members of a union or otherwise to interfere with the statutory right to self-organization.

Mr. Speaker, does this finding bear out the statement of the committee—of which Mr. Davis was cochairman—and its members that it is in favor of placing reasonable restraints on the powers of each group involved?

Fourth, and last, did Winn-Dixie illegally threaten reprisals against employees, including the threat to close the store if the employees there voted for a union? If Winn-Dixie did, then it is guilty of a dastardly action, threatening reprisals against a group which cannot defend itself, and which fears that its very means of livelihood might be taken away. The court said:

We find substantial evidence on the record supporting the Board's conclusion that respondents violated section 8(a)(1) (of the Taft-Hartley Act) by interrogation and threats of reprisal, including a threat to close the Owensboro store in event a majority of the employees authorized the union to become their bargaining representative.

Does this square with the assertion of Mr. Davis, as a member of the committee, that he desires to assure the fundamental right of every American to work in his chosen occupation?

Can it be said, Mr. Speaker, that it was only one store of a number of stores owned by the Winn-Dixie Co., Inc., which did these dastardly things, and that Mr. Davis, as president of the company cannot be connected with the action of one of its stores?

No, Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth District, Cincinnati said:

The parent corporation, respondent Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., is liable together with its subsidiary for the unfair labor practices found with respect to the Owensboro store.

It further said that:

The respondents have common officers, directors, and operators; that the common directors and operators formulate and administer a common labor policy for both respondents; that the same directors sit as the ultimate managerial authority for both the parent and subsidiary; and that the basic labor relations policy of the subsidiary emanates from the headquarters of the parent corporation in Jacksonville, Fla.

In order to realize the extent of the dangers inherent in the actions of the Taft-Hartly busting company known as Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., it must be realized that this is a giant corporation, for as the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth District, Cincinnati, said:

Respondent Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., a Florida corporation, operates through sub-

sidaries or divisions some 600 retail food supermarkets in the southeastern part of the United States.

And so we have the whole sorry story, Mr. Speaker. It is a story of harsh, unprincipled, abusive breaking of the Taft-Hartley Act by a company whose president now serves as a cochairman of a "National Committee To Keep the Taft-Hartley Act Intact and Protect Fundamental American Rights."

It is a sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker, when a company which has broken a national law, and unlawfully abused its employees, piously preaches about preserving a law it has so flagrantly violated, and about protecting the rights and interests of the American workingman. This sorry incident may well serve as a warning to the Members of this House that not all those who proclaim their devotion to the rights of the individual workingman, and to his right to work, deserve either the respect or attention of the Nation.

Southeast Asia's Chance for Peace: A Thai View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of May 9, 1965, an interesting speech delivered by the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, at a recent meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in London.

The speech, which I am sure will be of substantial value to all Members of Congress, follows:

SOUTHEAST ASIA'S CHANCE FOR PEACE: A THAI VIEW

(NOTE.—As assessment of the dangerous situation in southeast Asia and particularly the United States role there is contained in this speech by Thailand Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman. It was delivered last Monday to the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in London.)

Ever since the Second World War came to an end, southeast Asia has enjoyed little if any peace. While legitimate nationalistic aspirations have led subjugated peoples to merge as free and independent nations, other aggressive and expansionist forces have relentlessly been at work attempting to exert their influence and to bring these new entities within their orbit of authority.

The main attacks were directed against the former colonial territories, hitherto known as Indochina, probably because their former rulers, failing to realize the deep yearnings of the subjected peoples to be masters of their own destiny, overstayed their welcome until they met with a military disaster in the battlefield of an unknown little spot in Vietnam, Dien Bien Phu, which since then has been glorified as a landmark of victory for liberty over the unenlightened form of western colonialism. The results of that famous battle made the position of the then colonial rulers untenable and the latter had to bow to the inevitable. The 1954 Geneva Conference was then called to arrange for

their more or less honorable exit from the scene they dominated for so long.

SEEDS OF THE TROUBLE

As that international conference closed its doors, it was clear that while a few nations were in effect ushered into a new life of insecure independence, more substantial gains went to an ambitious and ruthless group who, from the very beginning, nurtured the design of supplanting the retiring colonial regime with their own new form of colonialism, the Communist colonialism, which is even more exacting and more destructive of liberty. Thus the triumph of freedom was less real than it was made to appear. In fact, as a result of the 1954 Geneva agreements, the frontiers of the Communist empire rolled further southward to the 17th parallel, while to the west, the unlawful Communist occupation of northern Laos continued and was later expanded despite provisions to the contrary of the same agreements.

Thus the seeds of present troubles in southeast Asia, particularly in South Vietnam and Laos, must be traced to the past neglect and colonial mismanagement as also to the Geneva agreement of 1954, which by legally sanctioning a Communist state in North Vietnam gave the Communist powers a convenient base for further expansion. To many who attended that fateful conference on Indochina, a clear realization dawned unmistakably that the Communists would not be content with their new acquisitions but were bent upon extending then further almost without limits. Hence the necessity of trying to stem the Communist expansionist tides and this was how our organization came into being.

From its inception, SEATO inherited a burdensome legacy of deep division, of instability and notably of boundless rapacity of nearby countries to gobble up their neighbors. Nevertheless, it bravely assigned to itself the momentous task of resisting further Communist aggression through collective means of defense. The first real challenge came some 6 years later when Communist aggressors, seeking a more convenient access for their infiltration into South Vietnam threatened to overrun Laos. SEATO, then, racked by incohesion and undermined from within, hesitated and faltered. Evidently the organization was not up to its task. The responsibility therefore had to be shifted to another Geneva conference in which Communist powers also took part. With proper perspective, the outcome of that conference which some naively thought to be the pattern of peace for southeast Asia and perhaps for the world, could be now more properly assessed. The Communist elements which, as a result of the Geneva agreements of 1962, secured a legal foothold in the coalition government of Laos, as could be expected, were not satisfied with the gains they had made there. Consequently, holding that Laos was only a secondary target which would be easily taken if the main target were to fail, they escalated their campaign of terrorism as well as their military activities in South Vietnam in the hope of delivering what they thought to be the "coup de grace" to South Vietnam which they have always held to be their primary objective of colonial expansion.

On this occasion, I should like to pay the respectful tribute of the Thai Government and people to the gallant men and women of South Vietnam and the United States who gave their lives to uphold the cause of peace and freedom in South Vietnam. May I add how heartening it is to us all the decision of the Government of Australia to send a contingent of Australian forces into South Vietnam.

Although South Vietnam is actually a protocol state placed under this Organization's protective umbrella at the insistence of its former colonial rulers, SEATO has shown little, if any, ability to deal with the

A2292

emergency. In fact, had it not been for the willingness of a member of this Organization, the United States, to assume responsibility and to accept sacrifices for the defense of South Vietnam, that nation may well have long been lost to the Communist aggressors.

As we meet here today, I hope none of us will fail to realize how crucial the struggle in Vietnam is and that the outcome will transcend the borders of that country and is bound to affect not only southeast Asia but the entire free world.

What, then, can this Organization do?

Obviously our duty is not, and cannot be, to borrow that famous expression, "to preside over the liquidation" of either South Vietnam, or, for that matter, of free southeast Asia, in favor of the Communists. Rather, we are committed, singly and collectively, to defend southeast Asia against Communist aggression and to help keep that region free.

RESISTING COMMUNISTS

For that purpose, what is needed is much less good advice or wise counsels, which have been flowing rather liberally and gratuitously during these past few years, as a firm determination to resist Communist encroachments and the willingness to take necessary risks and even to accept sacrifices. To some, the price may seem too high and they may prefer to retreat rather than to stand firm. But these are the people who have not learned and will probably never learn the lessons of history and today they may be the same as those who, 30 years ago, failed to take appropriate measures when a few ill-equipped Hitlerite divisions moved into the Rhineland. In so doing they made the Second World War become a certainty and paved the way for a terrible holocaust in which more than 20 million human beings were immolated. They should be responsible, if not before the law but in their conscience for this grievous and utterly purposeless loss. Across the Atlantic, these people are known as "doves" who claim to be the apostles of peace. In fact, by bowing to the aggressors and allowing the latter to fortify themselves with the flesh and blood of their victims, they are deserting and even betraying the cause of peace. If we allow them, these apostates who bear in their conscience the responsibility for the loss of so many human lives will again send even more millions of people to their doom.

APPEASEMENT WON'T WORK

Though we live far away from Europe, therefore less likely to profit from the wisdom of that continent, we profoundly realize that nowadays, as in the past, no peace can be bought by sacrificing a free nation, be it South Vietnam or southeast Asia or, for that matter, any other nation in the world. On the contrary, the chances for an enduring peace will become greater if we can see to it that aggressions against free nations, either in overt or covert form, will not be profitable. Rather we should make it clear beyond doubt that those who commit them will be made to pay dearly for their mischiefs. Only thus can southeast Asia, Europe, and indeed the whole world enjoy peace and tranquility.

THAILAND'S ROLE

In so saying, let it be well understood that there are no warmongers in my country. We are too close to the scene of battles not to know that should a large scale conflict break out in the area, Thailand, as other nearby nations, could hardly enjoy immunity from the effects of such a conflict. That is why, perhaps more than many other nations, the Thai Government and people have every reason to work for a peaceful solution to the existing problems, rather than allowing the present tense situation to drift toward an armed conflict. We indeed prefer, as President Johnson so generously suggested, to see the resources of our nations devoted to the improvement of human welfare and to the realization of man's age-old hope for a bet-

ter future than to be expended for the killing of other men. For after all, what the Thai people desire most is not to have their names inscribed on a war memorial, but live their lives as free men and to be able to shape their own destiny. However such a desire for peace and constructive approach to international problems have not been reciprocated, and every gesture of conciliation and reasonable solution is taken as a sign of weakness and met with arrogant aggressiveness from the Communists. Thailand, in effect, has recently been openly threatened with guerrilla warfare within its territory.

MUST FACE CHALLENGE

Under these circumstances, there remain few if any other alternative but to face the challenge to our free and independent existence with determination.

At this grave hour, the Thai nation hopes that its friends and allies, as well as other free peoples, realize that Thailand's future as that of southeast Asia will also have a deep bearing on their own freedom and well-being. If we fail to close our ranks we will be encouraging the actual or potential aggressors to become bolder to the point of plunging the world into a hostility which none of us desires. By remaining firm and resolute, the risks we are taking are infinitely smaller than the ones we may face later, if through lack of conscious realization and indecision, we choose the temporary expedient of yielding to threats and retreat. Let the name of that south German town, Munich, be a constant reminder to us all that appeasement is still the surest way of losing peace.

Joint Congressional Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the special Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress opened its hearings in the old Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol Building.

Members of Congress will be heard over the next two weeks if they so desire to appear before the joint committee.

As cochairman of this committee I am submitting the statement made by me at the opening hearings:

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, COCHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Congress acted wisely when it authorized this joint congressional committee to hold hearings and make recommendations on streamlining and modernizing the legislative procedures of both branches of the U.S. Congress.

On only one occasion in modern history of our Government has this legislative step been taken, and that was over 20 years ago when Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The LaFollette-Monroney joint committee was primarily responsible for this act. We are, indeed, fortunate to have Senator MIKE MONRONEY as a cochairman of this joint congressional committee, since he was in 1946 a Member of the House and the cochairman, along with Senator LaFollette, of the earlier committee.

The LaFollette-Monroney committee made a remarkable contribution to the functions of Congress by reducing the permanent committees of the House from 48 to 18. It also made a number of other valuable recom-

mendations that were adopted in both Houses. Some of the changes adopted through the recommendations of the LaFollette-Monroney committee have not been implemented and others have been outgrown by reason of population explosion and the numerous additional functions assumed by the Congress. Certainly some of the duties we have today never even occurred to the Members in 1946.

But at that time the Members did not nor could not realize that the next 20 years would bring about a fantastic scientific advancement of modern office inventions, computer systems and work-saving devices, most of which were totally undreamed of during the days of World War II.

For example, in 1965 our annual budget has risen to approximately \$100 billion and our gross national product in 20 years has increased from \$220 billion to approximately \$660 billion. (Secretary Dillon predicted that figure would be reached by the end of 1965.)

After the long program of hearings which this committee is scheduling, additional recommendations on organizational and legislative procedures will, no doubt, be made which the House and the Senate will adopt in order to carry out the intentions for which this joint committee has been organized.

I predict this committee, in its report, will make recommendations to the various governmental departments, including the Bureau of the Budget, to forward systematically to the desk of each Congressman and Senator, a simple abbreviated breakdown of all appropriations properly bracketed as to "purpose for expenditures" so that each Congressman can understand the purposes for every dollar appropriated in our annual gigantic budget of around \$100 billion.

The committee can also explore the advisability of saving time on lengthy and tedious rollcalls and quorum calls by the possible installation of modern electrical systems for that purpose. For example, a 5-hour congressional day and a 35-minute average for rollcalls or quorum calls will waste approximately 70 congressional days in a 12-month session of the Congress.

Possible recommendations, after testimony is taken, could be worked out for simplifying and reducing the cumbersome subcommittee system which has expanded beyond reason in some of the House and Senate committees.

The inexcusable and extravagant time which has been wasted on unnecessary filibusters, some of which extend to 2 or 3 months, can also be reviewed by this committee in order to save the time of both Houses and the expense to the taxpayers.

Also some recommendations seem appropriate to develop a system whereby committees can begin work immediately after the convening of a new session of Congress. By so doing, the House can proceed to act upon legislation within a few weeks after the convening of Congress.

The committee could explore the advisability of establishing a code of ethics, eliminating fabulous campaign expenses, conflict of interest of Members, and numerous other areas which could eventuate a great saving to the American taxpayer.

Our forefathers, in the colonial days, decided on a 2-year term for the Members of the House of Representatives. Since that time, practically all offices on city, county, and State level have been extended to 4-year terms. The committee could explore this angle progressively and if the Congress saw fit, it could, under its own authority and jurisdiction, adopt a recommendation for an amendment to the Constitution extending the term of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years. When a Member is sworn into office in January, after his November election, he is then within 12 months of another campaign and a great deal of his time and money is spent on and wasted in

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2303

ers is the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, a generation and transmission cooperative, which is operating the first nuclear power facility built in our State.

The people of Minnesota know the value of the REA programs and are grateful for the opportunity to enjoy rural electric and telephone service at rates which would not be possible except for the favorable terms which the Congress has made available. In reviewing the history of the REA programs, we are impressed that the Government used its credit to help rural people gain the blessings of rural electrification and later to help rural areas get modern dial telephone service. There were risks, great ones, but farmers and other rural residents took much of the risk out of the programs by their enthusiastic reception of electric power and telephone service.

So it is with pride that I call attention to the great achievements made under the REA programs in Minnesota.

Despite criticism of REA, we in Minnesota have seen no evidence that the rural electrification program has turned away from its original purposes. In Minnesota, five out of every six farms today receive electric service from REA-financed rural power systems. The partnership of local people with their Federal Government was the means by which rural Minnesota was able to enter the wondrous electrical age. In 1935, when REA began, only 6.8 percent of Minnesota's farms had central station electric service. For the Nation, the percentage of farms so electrified in 1935 was 10.9 percent. Today, 99 percent of our Minnesota farms have central station electric service, against 98 percent for the entire Nation.

Today, the Minnesota rural electric borrowers are operating almost 85,000 miles of line, both distribution and transmission, to serve almost 250,000 farm and other rural consumers. About one-half of these rural consumers are farmers.

Because Minnesota farmers have found cooperatives an effective means of solving tough problems, 52 of the 54 Minnesota electric borrowers under the REA program are rural electric cooperatives. The other two are municipalities—Litchfield and New Prague—which used REA financing to serve rural needs. The loan to New Prague has been fully repaid.

The first REA loan in the State was approved in September 1935. Since then, REA has approved loans totaling \$248 million. REA had advanced \$191.8 million of this amount on December 31, 1964.

It must be recognized that the job of rural electrification in Minnesota has been made difficult by the built-in handicaps which are found in so many rural areas of this country. The Minnesota rural electric systems have had to contend with low consumer density per mile of line, 2.8 consumers for the Minnesota cooperatives, compared with 3.3 consumers per mile for all REA borrowers. As a result, the Minnesota borrowers, despite their great progress, have averaged annual revenues of only \$480 per

mile, whereas the class A and B commercial utilities in Minnesota averaged 38.7 consumers and \$8,599 per mile.

The Minnesota rural electric cooperatives are also handicapped by a lack of diverse loads and large power consumers. And they operate as isolated systems, which adds to cost and difficulty of operation.

Their principal handicap at the outset was the high cost of wholesale power. Some of the early cooperatives were asked to pay more than 2 cents per kilowatt-hour at wholesale. Fortunately, the availability of power from Federal dams on the Missouri River helped to reduce somewhat the high power costs for Minnesota rural electric cooperatives. The availability of REA loans for generation and transmission facilities also is helping to bring this cost down.

In finding ways to surmount their handicaps, the Minnesota rural electric systems have fully justified the confidence of their organizers and members with outstanding performances in almost every phase of operation and service.

By January 1, 1965, REA borrowers in Minnesota had made a total of \$140,988,227 in payments on their Government loans. The payments included \$64,802,835 repaid on principal as due, \$12,950,685 of principal paid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of \$33,234,707. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

Consumers served by REA borrowers in the State are using increasing amounts of electricity on their farms and in their rural homes and businesses. In 1954, the average monthly consumption per consumer was 293 kilowatt-hours. By 1964, the average had risen to 560 kilowatt-hours. The continuing objective of REA borrowers in Minnesota is to provide the electric service required by their consumers under rates and conditions comparable to those available in urban communities.

The growth in power consumption points up one of the principal concerns of rural electric systems as they plan for the future—the assurance of an adequate supply of power at low cost. The power requirements of all REA-financed rural systems rose from 30 billion kilowatt-hours in 1960 to 41 billion in 1964. Looking to the future, REA estimates that its borrowers will need at least 65 billion kilowatt-hours by 1970, 87 billion kilowatt-hours in 1975, and 116 billion kilowatt-hours in 1980.

For Minnesota borrowers, power requirements will rise from the 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of 1964 to 2.7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1970, 3.4 billion kilowatt-hours in 1975, and 4.3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1980. By 1985, incidentally, the Minnesota rural systems will require 5.3 billion kilowatt-hours, or more than three times the total for 1964.

These estimates underscore the fact that the task of rural electrification is far from finished. In the 30-year-old REA program, as with our highways, the job is not finished when the initial system is built.

As REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp has pointed out, along with their total power requirements, the capital requirements of REA-financed systems will increase in the years ahead. Mr. Clapp

has said that REA borrower systems may need as much as \$8.1 billion in new capital between 1965 and the end of 1980. In 1980, the REA borrowers may need as much as \$675 million for investment in new facilities to serve their consumers.

I regret that time is not available for me to discuss the accomplishments and needs in Minnesota and the Nation adequately or fully. I do wish, however, to state that rural electrification progress has been facilitated in our State by the close cooperation of all types of power suppliers. The power cooperatives in Minnesota are working with the commercial utilities in the creation of power pools and the planning of future facilities for maximum economy.

Crime Rate a Growing Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the growing crime rate in America is becoming the tragedy of our age. Our country faces many crucial problems, probably more now than at any time in our history; but the wave of crime, in my opinion, supersedes almost any other in the terrible results it will have upon our Nation's future.

Nowhere is this fact more glaringly apparent than here in Washington. We must take immediate and the most determined steps to come to grips with America's crime problem.

I insert in the Record in this regard a recent column by David Lawrence which contains a brief but terribly tragic story for us all to consider:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD TAKE STERN MEASURES TO COMBAT GROWING CRIME WAVE IN THE COUNTRY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is to be commended for sending marines into Santo Domingo to protect the lives of 1,200 or more Americans and European nationals—but there are those who say he hasn't gone far enough. They point to the tens of thousands of Americans living in Washington, D.C., who need similar protection, particularly at night. Even servicemen in military installations near large cities are being warned, because of at least two or three persons.

The situation in the District of Columbia is not far different from what it is in other parts of the United States. But it so happens that the President has complete authority to govern the National Capital and to use Federal troops as policemen to protect the lives of the residents. Many marines and soldiers in the Regular Army have no heavy duties at their military bases or barracks and could be employed to guard the lives of American citizens in this country, especially in the evening hours.

The tragedies are numerous. Here is an excerpt from a letter just received by this correspondent from a serviceman who has fought gallantly for his country:

"My wife and I both worked our way through college. We lived and worked in the District of Columbia, where she was graduated at the Southeastern University and also attended the Corcoran School of Art. She was a talented artist, accountant, and legal

May 11, 1965

secretary. In December 1962, she got off a bus in Southeast Washington, where we lived. A teenage colored boy ran up behind her and slugged her viciously with a brick or club, knocking her down on the walk, and almost broke her arm when he jerked the purse off her arm. She was covered with blood and hospitalized nearly a week.

"Last August 25, 1964, she went out of the apartment about midnight with a flashlight looking for her cat. She was 55 years old. A 20-year-old Negro grabbed her around the neck with an arm lock and attempted to drag her into the nearby woods to rape her. When she screamed for help, he stabbed her four times with some vicious, narrow daggers, almost like ice picks. She died 12 days later in the hospital. Although she was given many blood transfusions and operated upon by the best doctors in Washington. Servicemen in the Department of Defense gave 16 pints of blood to the hospital in her memory. There is no use my attempting to tell you how terribly I feel about this: I cry all the time about losing her, and just scream when I think of the attack by this vicious brute.

"The police did a good job catching him, but he hasn't been convicted yet and may beat the case, although they found her wrist-watch in his pocket. He has been in jail 6 months waiting trial.

"There is nothing more to add. It is really a matter of the survival of our country, if the crime wave isn't stopped. In the meantime, merchants are being shot to death and policemen maimed right here in the shadow of the Capitol.

"Would use of the marines and troops be possible to stop the crime wave? Should all men be fingerprinted? Should criminals be deported? Surely there must be some solution to save our country. It is more dangerous to walk the streets of Washington, D.C., than anything I faced in World War II or the service during the Korean police action, and I have nine campaign ribbons and lived through it, only to find my wife murdered in front of our home in Washington, D.C."

It would cost the Government of the United States hardly any extra funds to allocate troops to the major cities of the United States for night patrol duty. They could travel in automobiles and make tours every few minutes in all sections of a city. Eventually, of course, the States would have to appropriate money for permanent patrols by policemen of their own. But it might require months and months, if not years, to organize such additional forces. There could, however, be some immediate relief through the use of Federal troops.

The administration is studying the whole question of how it can be of help in getting better police protection for the entire country. But the project has not been given priority over everything else, and, while studies and surveys are being made, many Americans are losing their lives.

If the President were to send to Congress a message demanding immediate appropriations for the benefit of the States so that an emergency project for increasing the police forces could be put into operation, it would unquestionably be approved by American public opinion. For the war on crime deserves the highest priority on the list of domestic projects before the administration today.

The 10th of May

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, each year on the 10th of May, the people of the

free world commemorate a traditional Rumanian national holiday. This is the day which honors the achievement of Rumania's independence from Ottoman oppression and the founding of its kingdom. The observance by the free world is to signify to the Rumanian people behind the Iron Curtain that they have not been forgotten and will not be forgotten.

The American people share the hopes and aspirations of the Rumanian people for national liberty. On this commemoration of the 10th of May, we hope they will find new strength in their determination to celebrate the freedom and independence they rightfully earned nearly a century ago.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of Staten Island Reformed Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Staten Island Reformed Church celebrated its 300th anniversary this year and on May 2 at the 4 p.m. service a beautiful plaque was unveiled. The plaque reads:

In 1665 a small group of the first Dutch settlers came to the shores of this Island banded together for the worship of Almighty God. Through three centuries, faithful men and women have continued this ministry to the community, the Nation, and the world.

John M. Braisted, Jr., district attorney for Richmond County, and a member of the Reformed Church, played the organ for this historic service.

A message from President Johnson to Rev. Jack Hascup, pastor, was delivered by me as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Rev. JACK HASCUP,
The Reformed Church of Staten Island,
Staten Island, N.Y.:

I have learned with much pleasure from Congressman MURPHY that the Reformed Church on Staten Island is observing the 300th anniversary of its founding.

On this joyous and memorable occasion you may recall with pride and satisfaction the many fruitful years of service rendered by your church to God and to your community.

I am happy to extend to you and to your members my heartiest greetings and warm congratulations. I hope that the years ahead will be replete with abundant blessings for you and for the members of your church.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The church services were edifying and enlightening to all who attended. In the front row of the church, seven little girls in Dutch costumes set the tone for the occasion and they were a reminder to all that although costumes and materials have changed, the principles and faith in our heritage and religion have not.

The former pastor of the church from 1948 to 1959, Rev. Cornelius Vander Naald, gave the principal address.

Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Time magazine, now on the stands, carries in its weekly feature, "Time Essay," an excellent analysis of why the United States is in Vietnam, and why it should remain there.

The essay, entitled "Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time," places in the most succinct and logical manner that I have seen to date the justification for President Johnson's bold determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam.

I believe Time magazine has rendered an imposing public service by raising the six most frequently asked questions about America's policy in Vietnam, and then methodically answering these questions with arguments that, in my judgment, leave little room, if any, for rebuttal.

It is particularly noteworthy that Time magazine recalls the arguments of those who have been most critical of President Johnson's policy, and then proceeds to show how wrong they had been in the past in their criticism of other instances in American foreign policy. Mr. Walter Lippmann, noted American columnist, who has been highly critical of President Johnson's Vietnam policy, is quite properly singled out by Time magazine as being the same Walter Lippmann, who during the Greek crisis of 1947-49, would have abandoned our gallant wartime ally, Greece.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that all Americans would have an opportunity to read this excellent Time magazine analysis in order to have a more thorough understanding why the United States must take the steps we are taking in Vietnam, and why President Johnson deserves our undivided support in his effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Time essay follows:

TIME ESSAY: VIETNAM—THE RIGHT WAR AT THE RIGHT TIME

The Caribbean is closer to U.S. shores than the South China Sea, but despite the nearby uproar in the Dominican Republic, the crucial test of American policy and will is still taking place in Vietnam.

By and large, U.S. public opinion seems strongly behind Lyndon Johnson's unyielding strategy of bombing the North and stepped-up ground action in the South. At the same time, an insistent—if by no means unanimous—chorus of criticism is heard, particularly on college campuses, from faculty as well as students. Teach-ins, petitions, and picketing get headlines. Most of the critics argue that the United States should stop the bombing and get out quickly, giving an odd combination of pragmatic and supposedly ethical reasons.

The pragmatic reasons add up to the notion that the United States either cannot win or need not win in order to safeguard its interests. The moral objections are often weakened by the fact that, while the critics condemn the use of force against North Vietnam, they either condone or ignore it in other

situations—such as Sukarno's guerrilla war against Malaysia, Red China's conquest of Tibet or, most important, the Vietcong's own terror against South Vietnamese peasants.

QUESTIONS OF REALITY

Herewith a discussion of the six principal arguments.

The struggle in Vietnam is a civil war and the United States has no right to interfere. Certainly, there are elements of a civil war present. Many Vietcong are not hard-line Communists but nationalistic and social revolutionaries whose aims include land reform and reunification. But as elsewhere, the local revolution has been captured by communism. The Vietcong have some autonomy, but they are trained, directed, and supplied by North Vietnam. In the Communist rebellions in Greece and Malaya, for example, almost identical arguments were heard; these were called civil wars in which the United States was supposedly backing reactionary regimes that lacked popular support and could not win. And yet in both cases, when outside Red help was shut off, the rebellions collapsed. Because the West has lately learned to live with Communist regimes that have been forced to cut back their export of revolution, it is sometimes forgotten that communism still remains an international aggressive movement, that infiltration and subversion remain realities, not words to frighten children. No struggle in which communism is involved is ever truly a civil war.

The South Vietnamese people don't care whether they live under communism or not, as long as they get peace. Obviously they desperately want peace, and they need more positive hopes than just anticommunism to keep them going. But after a decade, South Vietnam's army is still fighting, and sustaining casualties proportionately higher than U.S. casualties in two World Wars. This is an amazing fact, recently heightened by the decline in Government desertions, and in the increase in new recruitment.

The United States cannot fight for democracy by backing more or less undemocratic regimes in Saigon. A democratic regime is hardly possible in a war-torn country without much democratic tradition. What the critics fail to admit is that even a bad non-Communist regime is usually subject to change, but once a Communist regime is established, it is virtually irreversible. Taking up the argument that the integrity of U.S. democracy at home depends on an end to the war, Columnist Max Lerner, himself a professor, recently replied: "No, it depends on not flinching from the reality principle, on maintaining clear goals without hypocrisy, and in showing that democracy has what it takes for survival against ruthless forces both at home and abroad."

North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh might turn into the Tito of Asian communism. This is possible, but only if Red China changes its nationalist-expansionist direction. Tito's Yugoslavia is separated by 200 miles of Carpathian wilderness from Russia, while North Vietnam has a common frontier with China. Moreover, the Chinese have traditionally pushed south. Ho, whose basic training and sympathies derive from the Soviet Union, is now 75; most of his rising lieutenants are pro-Peiping. A Vietnam united under Communist rule would, for the foreseeable future, remain a Peiping satellite. It is absurd to suggest that after winning all of Vietnam the Communists would then sit back and turn "mellow." Inevitably, they would seek domination of the whole area, and there is no sign that they would be resisted except in Thailand—and even here the Red pressure would be enormous.

U.S. escalation in Vietnam is pushing Red China and Russia together. Despite some parallel warlike noises from Moscow and Peiping, there is little to support this belief. China seeks to control the Communist move-

ment throughout the world, hopes to win that control by showing that "wars of liberalization" pay off. Russia, on the other hand, is unwilling to give up the hard-won détente with the West, which permits Moscow greater concentration on internal development, in favor of the Chinese hard line. Should Mao prove his point by winning in South Vietnam, Russia might well be forced into greater militancy.

Asia is not of vital importance to the United States. After all, so runs this argument, the United States is not omnipotent. Walter Lippmann contends that Asia is legitimately the sphere of Chinese influence, just as the Western Hemisphere is America's.¹ That contention is questionable. Since the early 19th century, the United States has grown to a major Pacific maritime power; to surrender the Pacific to China now makes no more sense than surrendering it to Imperial Japan would have in 1941. With southeast Asia gone, the United States would rapidly approach a point where it might have no foothold in Asia from Okinawa to Australia. Beyond that, the argument cannot be sustained in the light of modern weaponry: geographic spheres of influence are simply not pertinent in an era of ICBM's. The Chinese themselves pay no attention to the theory, as is shown by their activities in Africa and Latin America.

DANGERS OF INACTION

The chief immediate demand of the critics is that the United States negotiate. But such an argument leaves out of account the fact that the Communists use negotiations only as a tactic to make further gains—unless they are forced by superior power or self-interest to stick to their bargains. They quickly broke the Geneva agreement of 1954 and the Laos agreement of 1962 by refusing to withdraw Communist guerrilla forces. Despite vague talk, no one has advanced even the outlines of an international arrangement that could keep South Vietnam secure from communism. Hanoi and Peiping show no sign of considering any international agreement except the kind of neutralization that would put the Vietcong in a position to capture power in Saigon.

Obviously, after overcoming his early hesitation, Lyndon Johnson will not allow the United States to be pushed out of Vietnam. For if that were to happen, Americans would only have to make another stand against Asian communism later, under worse conditions and in less tenable locations. As Demosthenes said about expansionist Macedonia in the fourth century B.C.: "You will be wise to defend yourselves now, but if you let the opportunity pass, you will not be able to act even if you want to." Despite all its excruciating difficulties, the Vietnamese struggle is absolutely inescapable for the United States in the mid-sixties—and in that sense, it is the right war in the right place at the right time.

¹Irritated by the Lippmann argument, Pentagon officials made a study of his columns during the Greek crisis of 1947-49 and concluded: "My God, Walter would have given away Greece, too."

Jewish Labor Committee Asks Poland and Russia for Information on Nazi Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the search for escaped Nazi war criminals

continues and the German Government now has 4½ more years to locate these outcasts as a result of the extension of the German statute of limitations.

In a recent letter to the Procurator General of the Soviet Union and the Minister of Justice of Poland, the chairman and executive secretary of the Jewish Labor Committee requested those two officials to furnish to the German Government whatever documents which may be in their possession concerning Nazi war criminals.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued by the Jewish Labor Committee containing the text of the letter:

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE ASKS POLAND AND RUSSIA FOR INFORMATION ON NAZI CRIMES

NEW YORK.—The Jewish Labor Committee has called upon the Governments of Poland and Soviet Russia to make available to Germany documents naming Nazi criminals who have not yet been prosecuted.

In a letter to the Polish and Soviet Ministers of Justice signed by Adolph Held, chairman, and Benjamin Tabachinsky, executive secretary, the JLC stated that the 4½-year extension of the statute of limitations on Nazi crimes made it necessary that the German police authorities act with all deliberate speed if the criminals are to be brought to justice.

The JLC leaders pointed out that the German authorities have repeatedly stated that they would have had better results in their research for Nazi criminals if they had the information that was possessed by the Polish and Russian Governments. At the end of World War II, tons of German documents were captured by the invading armies from the East and removed to Warsaw and Moscow.

In their communication Messrs. Held and Tabachinsky stated to the Russian and Polish officials: "We feel sure that you too have the greatest interest in seeing to it that the criminals of the Nazi-Hitler period should be apprehended and brought before the bar of justice for their crimes."

The JLC letter concluded with the request that photostatic copies of the documents possessed by the Russians and Poles be promptly made available to the law enforcement authorities "thereby helping to eliminate all obstacles to the punishment of those Nazi criminals who have thus far escaped justice."

The following is the text of the JLC letter. The identical letter was sent to Roman A. Rudenko, Procurator General of the U.S.S.R., and Marian Rybicky, Minister of Justice of the People's Republic of Poland.

"DEAR MR. MINISTER: As you know, the German Parliament has voted to extend the statute of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi crimes for an additional period of about 4½ years. Our organization has always opposed and fought against any statute of limitations whatever on the crimes of the Nazis. However, as you know, our position was not accepted and the 4½-year compromise was adopted.

As a result of the decision of the German Parliament it is necessary for the German police and judicial authorities to move effectively and with all deliberate speed to round up and indict all Nazi criminals who were active in the extermination of European civilians, Jewish and non-Jewish.

During discussions with various German agencies about the statute of limitations, they repeatedly pointed out that they would have achieved better results and would have been able to punish more Nazi criminals if they had possessed the various documents in your possession. On our part, we feel sure that you too have the greatest interest in seeing to it that the criminals of the Nazi-Hitler period should be appre-

A2306

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 11, 1965

hended and brought before the bar of justice for their crimes.

We therefore appeal to you most urgently that you do all in your power to make these documents available to the West German Government. We request that you make photostatic copies of your documents available for examination by the German law enforcement agencies, thereby helping to eliminate all obstacles to the punishment of those Nazi criminals who have thus far escaped justice."

Yours very truly,
ADOLPH HELD, *Chairman.*
BENJAMIN TABACHINSKY,
Executive Secretary.

**Address of the Vice President on Polish
Constitution Day at Chicago, Ill., May
2, 1965**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, Chicago observed the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day with a rally held in Humboldt Park, which is located in my congressional district. We were honored by the presence of the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who delivered the principal speech to the 150,000 people gathered for the occasion.

It was a stirring speech, so with permission I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ON POLISH
CONSTITUTION DAY, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 2,
1965

Distinguished reverend clergy, his honor, the great mayor of the great city of Chicago, Richard Daley; members of the county and city government, State legislators, my good friends of the Congress, the Congressmen from the district in which this great gathering is being held—Congressmen DAN ROSTENKOWSKI whom you all know well, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, DANNY and ROMAN invited me several times to be here. They promised me that with your intercession and divine providence and the mayor of Chicago all working together, we'd have good weather, and we have it. Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, who I trust is with us here today, and Congressman ED DERWINSKI, my good friends are all here on this great day to commemorate the Polish Constitution Day, the 174th anniversary of a document of freedom—a document of liberalism—a document of humanitarianism—a document of parliamentary government—a document of majority rule—a constitution of liberty for a great people. What a beautiful day it is to celebrate that memorable event of May 3, 1791—Polish Constitution Day.

May I pause for a moment in behalf of our country, in behalf of freedom-loving people everywhere, to pay our respects to a great soldier, to a great patriot of his own land, and to a fighter of freedom second to none. Of course, I refer to the distinguished soldier and patriot that has addressed us here today, General Marczek, who has graced this platform by his presence and by his words. The world will never forget this great general was commander of the famed Polish 1st Armored Division which took part in many

of the most important battles of World War II, and every battle was an honor to the general and his troops. And then, may I once again pay my respects to these distinguished statesmen who have come here representing the Assembly of the Captive European Nations. They're fine people, and Mr. Rozmarek, the citation and the medal you've received today is a high honor. I cherish in my office a plaque which I received a few years ago with the flags of the captive nations of Europe—a plaque which was an expression of appreciation on the part of those people for some work in the Congress of the United States which I was privileged to perform. So may I once again express my gratitude to these valiant, courageous lovers of freedom who have done so much for each and every one of us. And I want also to pay my respects today to the many fraternal organizations that are here—the Polish fraternal groups, the Polish veterans, and the many veterans organizations that are here on this memorable day; and above all, may I say a word of happiness and good cheer to the youth, to the young people, because, as Mrs. Humphrey and I had those few moments to witness a part of your parade, we were once again thrilled by the young people—their health, their vigor, their vitality.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk today a little bit about our citizenship as Americans. I want to talk to you a little bit about our responsibilities as a people and as a country, because this Nation of ours, as Mr. Rozmarek has indicated, has tremendous responsibilities today. Charles, I want you to know how grateful I am as Vice President of these United States to hear your words in support for the President, for the Congress, for the policy of the Government of the United States, as we defend freedom in southeast Asia and as we resist the most brutal form of terrorism and the most unbelievable and insidious form of subversion and aggression that this Nation has witnessed in all of its life, by the Communists in that area. And lest there be any doubt, let me remind you of the words of President Johnson in that memorable address at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore just a few weeks ago, when he told us that we will not be defeated, we will not withdraw, we will not tire, we will defend freedom and we will not sell out or sell away the liberties of others and call it peace. That lesson has been learned in this century. There is no peace for anyone, nor is there any freedom for anyone, if country after country—little countries—can be sold down the river into tyranny and into slavery. Freedom and peace are indivisible, and we have no intention my fellow Americans of withdrawing from the struggle, of seeking an easy truce or peace at the price of principle and freedom.

Yesterday, Mrs. Humphrey and I were at Williamsburg, Va., and at Jamestown, Jamestown, Va., represents the first English-speaking settlement in the United States—1707. There we were privileged to participate in the ceremony of new citizenship for about 200 immigrants that had come to our shores to become American citizens. And what a wonderful experience it was. What a glorious day. It was beautiful like today. And there they were, young people in the main, people of every race, creed, and nationality, people from Poland, people from Eastern Europe, people from the northern countries of Europe, from Asia, from Latin America, from Africa, from the Middle East. There they were taking that oath of allegiance to the United States of America. It was an exciting experience because I saw my country and our country strengthened. No one nation has a unique claim to America, but no people has a greater claim or can claim greater contributions to our country, to our beloved America, than those who came here from Poland. All one has to do is to

look at that statue, to look at that memorial to a great patriot, General Kosciuszko, one of the great fighters for freedom, one who helped America, and then we know that the people of Poland have made great contributions to our land.

From the earliest beginnings, America—our country—has benefited from the wisdom, the courage, the guidance, the leadership of the Polish people. We have benefited from the art and the literature and the beautiful music and the skill and the craftsmanship and the statesmanship and the love of liberty of the Polish people.

We share great heroes, as I've said, like Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and General Pulaski, men who have been heroes in battle and fighters for human rights and human dignity, battlers every one of them against tyranny, battlers against tyranny of the mind and spirit, as well as tyranny of the body politic.

As Americans of Polish descent, therefore, you share the strengths of two great peoples. Many of the democratic American traditions have their parallels in Polish history of a thousand years. Think of it—a thousand years. Might I add, that great Constitution that we commemorate today, of May 3, 1791, came to the Polish people only 2 years after our own Constitution. This, above all, proves to me that a good idea is a powerful weapon. And the good idea of American freedom and independence penetrated every land within a very few years after the adoption of our Constitution. That Constitution of Poland, dedicated to parliamentary government, had much of its inspiration, my fellow Americans, from our Constitution—we the people of these United States.

For most of that period of a thousand years, Poland has been an independent Christian nation, though there are those that today within her boundaries would ignore, and indeed destroy, these traditions, we know that the spirit of the real Poland never dies, and we know that the spirit of the liberty-loving free Poland will flower once again.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy said these words: "Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressure the Soviets may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned."

Ladies and gentlemen, those words of a departed President who loved Poland—those are the words of America today, just as truly now as then.

We are convinced that time is on the side of freedom—that is, if we put time to good use—if we put time to good use and do not abandon freedom.

We intend to put that time to good use, and we're doing it here today. We intend to build bridges to the Polish people—bridges which may now and then be obstructed at the other end, but which will be there to be cleared when the day of freedom dawns. We intend to build bridges that strengthen the bonds of friendship between America and the Polish people, and I say to Frances Dymek, as she read the resolutions here today, we intend to expand our programs of cultural exchange, of contact with the people of Poland, because, make no mistake about it my friends, Poland is not Communist—Poland is Polish, loving liberty. Poland is a friend of the United States, the likes of which I've never seen elsewhere and I've traveled in that country and know of what I speak. The people of Poland love our America, and the people of Poland love their nation, they love their history, and I wish my voice could go to the people of Poland—we love you too, and we stand with you, good people of Poland, for your days of freedom.

The fires of liberty are not dimmed in Polish hearts. The fires of their nationalism and their independence—they burn brightly. We must help sustain that fire.